

REMARKS

Applicants have studied the Office Action dated February 8, 2007. Claims 1-15 are pending. Claims 12-15 have been added.. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims in view of the above amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner:

- (2) Objected to the drawings;
- (3) Rejected claims 1-5 and 7-11 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Skarbo et al. (US Pat No. 6,108,028); and
- (4) Rejected claim 6 under 35 USC 103(a) as being anticipated by Skarbo et al. (US Pat No. 6,108,028) in view of Official Notice.

Rejection to Drawings

As noted above, the Examiner objected to the drawings because of handwritten labeling. Corrected drawings sheets have been submitted herewith in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. These drawings are identical to the informal drawings previously filed. No new matter has been added.

Overview of the Current Invention

Preferred Embodiments of the present invention provide an improved method and apparatus for configuring a local run-time environment for a user on a client workstation or client system. Today it is common for most corporate networks to use logon scripts because they assist with centralized administration. Logon scripts are difficult to create, edit, and administer. Also logon scripts in certain run-time environments such as Windows operating systems can be assigned to a single user or multiple users. Logon scripts are aptly name configuration files that run upon user logon to a workstation.

Currently available logon scripts do not validate if a desired setting is proper for a given user on a given client system. Stated differently, certain resources should not be set if a given group, a selected operating system and a selected connection method are not met. For example, a logon script may request a certain drive letter for the client, say drive letter "O" to be mapped to a particular resource, say a CD ROM on a server, however this can only happen if the user of the client is a member of a particular group. Today, no method exists to verify one or more local run-time environmental conditions on a client. The solution employed by Microsoft in its Windows Server 2000 and 2003 line of products is the use of Group Policy Objects at the server. This Group Policy Object solution although useful, is not able to make determinations of local run-time environments on the client. Therefore it is not possible to determine such things using group policies as host address, subnets, MAC, primary groups, whether terminal services is running, what third party applications are running, and whether the client system is a portable or desktop hardware configuration. This type of granularity of the client system local run-time environment is not available.

The present invention overcomes the problems with the prior art by providing client systems to validate local-run time environments prior to the application of one or more desktop settings on the client system. The present invention allows configurations of a local run-time environment for one or more user accounts on a client system based on an event.

In order to more particularly point out this feature for configuring a local run-time environment for a user on the client system, the following language has been added to the independent claim 1 as follows:

1. (Currently Amended) A method in a client-server environment, to manage a configuration of resources on at least one client system, the method on a client system comprising:

receiving on a client system from a server system a file of one or more predetermined events along with one or more c local run-time environmental conditions along with one or more selectable configuration settings, wherein the

local run-time environmental conditions are determined after a client system has started, and wherein the selectable configuration settings are specific to a group of users on the client system; and

running a monitoring agent on the client system to detect when one or more predetermined events of a user logon-on to the client system or a user log-off from the client system occurs then determining if the one or more local run-time environmental conditions are met and if the conditions are met then automatically applying at least one of the one or more selectable configuration settings on the client system;

wherein at least one of the predetermined events, the settings and the environmental conditions are previously set graphically on the server system using a graphical user interface with one or more user selectable selections therein.

Support for this amendment is found on page 9 paragraph [0037] and [0039], page 10, paragraph [0044], FIG. 4, and page 14 through page 18 of the application as originally filed. No new matter has been added.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

As noted above, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5 and 7-11 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Skarbo et al. (US Pat No. 6,108,028). Independent claim 1 has been amended to distinguish over Skarbo. The Examiner at page 4 of the office action states "*As to claim 1, Skarbo teaches a [...] receiving one or more predetermined events along with one or more c local run-time environmental conditions along with one or more selectable settings.*" The field of the present invention is directed to computer administrative management of configuration settings on client computers. The configuration settings for a local client machine are made by using a file received from a separate server computer. The file has a combination of i) predetermined events, ii) local run-time environmental conditions, and iii) selectable configuration settings, this

element of claim 1 has been amended to clarify over Skarbo's screen saver application in a video conferencing system by reciting.

receiving on a client system from a server system a file of one or more predetermined events along with one or more local run-time environmental conditions along with one or more selectable configuration settings, wherein the local run-time environmental conditions are determined after a client system has started, and wherein the selectable configuration settings are specific to a group of users on the client system;

Skarbo is completely silent on administrative management of local setting on a computer by receiving on a client system from a server system a file of one or more predetermined events along with one or more local run-time environmental conditions along with one or more selectable configuration settings. Accordingly, independent claim 1 as clarified distinguishes over the screen saver activation and deactivation in a video conferencing system as taught by Skarbo for at least this reason.

The Applicants have clarified the definition of the term "local run-time environmental conditions" by stating positively reciting "wherein the local run-time environmental conditions are determined after a client system has started."

Further, Skarbo is completely silent on "wherein the selectable configuration settings are specific to a group of users on the client system." Accordingly, independent claim 1 as clarified distinguishes over the screen saver activation/deactivation in a video network as taught by Skarbo for at least this reason as well.

Continuing further, the Examiner at page 4 of the office action states "*As to claim 1, Skarbo teaches a [...] running a monitoring agent on the client system to detect when one or more predetermined events occur then determining if the one or more local run-time environmental conditions are met and if the conditions are met then automatically applying at least one of the one or more selectable configuration settings on the client*

system.” The Applicants have clarified that the predetermined events are “a user logon-on to the client system or a user log-off from the client system” to recite

running a monitoring agent on the client system to detect when one or more predetermined events of a user logon-on to the client system or a user log-off from the client system occurs then determining if the one or more local run-time environmental conditions are met and if the conditions are met then automatically applying at least one of the one or more selectable configuration settings on the client system;

Skarbo is completely silent on the predetermined events are “a user logon-on to the client system or a user log-off from the client system.” Accordingly, independent claim 1 as clarified distinguishes over the screen saver activation/deactivation in a video network as taught by Skarbo for at least this reason as well.

Continuing further, the Examiner at page 4 of the office action states “*As to claim 1, Skarbo teaches a [...] wherein at least one of the predetermined events, the settings and the environmental conditions are previously set graphically using a graphical user interface with one or more user selectable selections therein.*” The Applicants have clarified that the “wherein at least one of the predetermined events, the settings and the environmental conditions are previously set graphically on the server system using a graphical user interface” to recite

wherein at least one of the predetermined events, the settings and the environmental conditions are previously set graphically on the server system using a graphical user interface with one or more user selectable selections therein.

Skarbo is completely silent on using a server system to set any the items received by the client system in a file. Accordingly, independent claim 1 as clarified distinguishes over the screen saver activation/deactivation in a video network as taught by Skarbo for at least this reason as well.

The Examiner cites 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and a proper rejection requires that a single reference teach (i.e., identically describe) each and every element of the rejected claims as being anticipated by Skarbo.¹ The elements referenced above in independent claim 1 are not taught or disclosed by Skarbo. Accordingly, the present invention distinguishes over Skarbo for at least these reasons. The Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) has been overcome.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to distinguish over Skarbo. Claims 2-5 and 7-11 depend from claim 1. Since dependent claims contain all the limitations of the independent claims, claims 2-5 and 7-11 distinguish over Skarbo, as well.

Regarding claim 2, has been amended to emphasize the temporal aspect of user logons. Support for this amendment is found on page 15, paragraph [0060]. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claim 2 distinguish over Skarbo for this reason as well.

Regarding claim 3, has been amended to emphasize the inactivity during user logon. Support for this amendment is found on page 18, paragraph [0071]. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claim 3 distinguish over Skarbo for this reason as well.

Regarding claim 4 and 10, have been amended to emphasize the script uses the file from the server to make changes to the client system. Support for this amendment is found on page 15, paragraph [0059]. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 4 and 10 distinguish over Skarbo for this reason as well.

¹ See MPEP §2131 (Emphasis Added) "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim."

Regarding claim 5, has been amended to emphasize user that logons is a member of a group of users authenticated to the system.. Support for this amendment is found on page 9, paragraph [0039] and page 16, paragraph [0062]. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claim 4 distinguish over Skarbo for this reason as well.

Regarding claim 7, has been amended to emphasize changing a registry setting to the client system. Support for this amendment is found on page 16, paragraph [0064]. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claim 7 distinguish over Skarbo for this reason as well.

Claims 12-15 have been added to clarify various patentable features of managing client computers and client workstations based upon selectable configuration settings and applying some of these configurations settings. Specifically, dependent claim 12, contains all the limitations of independent claim 1, which has been amended to clarify over Skarbo, but dependent claim 12 goes further and recites local run-time environmental conditions of an IP subnet address, a LAN group membership, and a registry entry. Skarbo is silent on using these types of local run-time environmental conditions to set a screen saver. Support for this amendment is found on page 16, paragraph [0062]. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claim 12 distinguish over Skarbo for this reason as well.

Independent claim 13, contains all the limitations of independent claim 1, which has been amended to clarify over Skarbo, and emphasizes the monitoring a predetermined events of start-up and shut down. Skarbo is silent on using these predetermine event of a hardware change on the client system. Support for this amendment is found on page 15, paragraph [0061], page 17, paragraph [0066] and page 18, paragraph [0071]. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claim 13 distinguish over Skarbo for this reason as well.

Independent claim 14, contains all the limitations of independent claim 1, which has been amended to clarify over Skarbo, and emphasizes the use of monitoring a predetermined event of hardware changes. Skarbo is silent on using these predetermine event of a hardware change on the client system. Support for this amendment is found on page 18, paragraph [0071]. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claim 13 distinguish over Skarbo for this reason as well.

Independent claim 15, contains all the limitations of independent claim 1, which has been amended to clarify over Skarbo, and emphasizes the use of monitoring a predetermined event of a network connection. Skarbo is silent on using these predetermine event of a network connection on the client system. Support for this amendment is found on page 18, paragraph [0071]. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claim 13 distinguish over Skarbo for this reason as well.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

As noted above, the Examiner rejected claim 6 under 35 USC 103(a) as being anticipated by Skarbo et al. (US Pat No. 6,108,028) in view of Official Notice. The Examiner goes on to combine Skarbo with Official Notice.² If the Examiner's statements are based on facts within the personal knowledge of the Examiner, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner support these references by filing an affidavit as is allowed under MPEP §707 citing 37 CFR 1.104(d)(2).

The Examiner recites 35 U.S.C. §103. The Statute expressly requires that obviousness or non-obviousness be determined for the claimed subject matter "as a whole," and the key to proper determination of the differences between the prior art and the present invention is giving full recognition to the invention "as a whole." As described in the section above entitled Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), independent claim 1 has

² Applicants makes no statement whether such combination is even proper.

been amended to clarify over Skarbo taken alone and/or in view of the Examiner's Official Notice.

Further, Applicants submit that the combination of Sarkbo with Official Notice *teaches away* from

receiving on a client system from a server system a file of one or more predetermined events along with one or more local run-time environmental conditions along with one or more selectable configuration settings, wherein the local run-time environmental conditions are determined after a client system has started, and wherein the selectable configuration settings are specific to a group of users on the client system; and

running a monitoring agent on the client system to detect when one or more predetermined events of a user logon-on to the client system or a user log-off from the client system occurs then determining if the one or more local run-time environmental conditions are met and if the conditions are met then automatically applying at least one of the one or more selectable configuration settings on the client system;

wherein at least one of the predetermined events, the settings and the environmental conditions are previously set graphically on the server system using a graphical user interface with one or more user selectable selections therein.

Sarkbo does not teach or suggest having predetermined conditions set graphically by another computer. Further, Sarkbo works only after the system is completely operational and does not monitor a local runtime event of logon or logoff. In Sarkbo, the video conferencing system is running a screen saver program which always happens after the event of logon and before the event of logoff. Stated differently, the client system must receive keyboard input and reflect the user selection during logon and logoff. By definition, a screen saver cannot not be running during these time periods. A screen saver only runs after a system boots, optional logon and authentication and an

operating system shell is presented to the user. Sarko specifically *teaches away* from this time period.

Moreover, the Federal Circuit has consistently held that when a §103 rejection is based upon a modification of a reference that destroys the intent, purpose or function of the invention disclosed in the reference, such a proposed modification is not proper and the *prima facie* case of obviousness can not be properly made. See *In re Gordon*, 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Here the intent, purpose and function of Skarbo is a activation and deactivation of a screen saver on a video conferencing system, in contrast the intent and purpose of the present invention is configuration of resources on a client system in a client-server system. The present invention provides administrative management of local setting on a computer by “receiving on a client system from a server system a file of one or more predetermined events along with one or more local run-time environmental conditions along with one or more selectable configuration settings.” This combination, as suggested by the Examiner, destroys the intent and purpose of Skarbo taken alone and/or in view of Official Notice. Accordingly, the present invention is distinguishable over Sarkbo taken alone and/or in view of Official Notice for this reason as well.

For the foregoing reasons, Claim 1 distinguishes over Skarbo. Claim 6 depend from claim 1. Since dependent claims contain all the limitations of the independent claims, claim 6 distinguish over Skarbo taken alone and/or in view of Official Notice, as well. Accordingly, Applicants believe that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) has been overcome and respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The prior art made of record and not relied upon was reviewed and Applicants believe that such prior art is not pertinent to Applicants' disclosure.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

Applicants acknowledge the continuing duty of candor and good faith to disclose information known to be material to the examination of this application. In accordance with 37 CFR §1.56, all such information is dutifully made of record. The foreseeable equivalents of any territory surrendered by amendment are limited to the territory taught by the information of record. No other territory afforded by the doctrine of equivalents is knowingly surrendered and everything else is unforeseeable at the time of this amendment by the Applicants and their attorneys.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to change any fees that may be required or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 50-1556. In view of the preceding discussion, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and re-examination is requested.

PLEASE CALL the undersigned if the Examiner believes that there are any informalities that can be corrected by Examiner's amendment, or that in any way it would help expedite the prosecution of the patent application.

Appl. No. 10/700,616
Docket No. 570-P0001
Reply to Office Action of February 8, 2007

Respectfully submitted.

Date: June 8, 2007

By: /Jon Gibbons/
Jon A. Gibbons
(Reg. No.37,333)

Attorney for Applicant

FLEIT KAIN GIBBONS
GUTMAN BONGINI & BIANCO P.L.
One Boca Commerce Center
551 N.W. 77th Street
Suite 111, Boca Raton, Florida 33487
Telephone: (561) 989-9811
Facsimile: (561) 989-9812
www.FocusOnIP.com